2171

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.—No. 21. **NEW YORK, N. Y., FEBRUARY 22, 1896.** **Whole No. 333.**

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

After ten years of persistent agitation, the "gamblers" of the Chicago board of trade have succeeded in getting a number of bucket-shop proprietors indicted by a grand jury. Perhaps it is needless to add that this exceptionally virtuous jury is now openly accused of soliciting bribes and blackmailing.

The stupid press is again congratulating itself on an alleged success of a government loan. The people, especially the bankers and capitalists, have demonstrated their confidence in the solvency and stability of the government by their eagerness to buy the bonds. Well, let us see. So far as the government's skill and success as a banker are concerned, it is rather difficult to see where the confidence has been shown. Everybody is aware that the reserve is but temporarily restored, and that there is nothing whatever to prevent an immediate withdrawal, by the same or other capitalists, of the gold secured by this loan. The government buys gold and pays a higher rate of interest than even the city of New York has to pay in the market. This gold can be taken out again and again, the government being compelled each time to issue new bonds and pay interest on them. Whatever confidence there may have been shown is simply confidence in the ability of the government to tax the country more heavily and contract the currency by locking up its notes and other fiat money. As such action directly injures the people, their confidence means confidence in the ability of the government to go on oppressing them and prolonging the industrial stagnation. Verily, only a nation of fools can rejoice at such prospects.

I am greatly obliged to Comrades Byington and Robinson for coming to my aid in my discussion with Mr. Bolton Hall. As a general thing all my comrades are too prone to leave the entire burden of the fighting upon me. When they are with me, they content themselves with writing me private letters, saying: "You're doing well, old man; keep it up; hit 'em again." It seems seldom to occur to them that they might strike a useful blow or two themselves. But, whenever they are against me, they rain the blows upon my head in most prompt and vigorous fashion. Well, it is a trick they have learned from me perhaps, and so I ought not to complain. None the less am I grateful when now and then a helping hand extends. In one point, however, I wish to correct Mr. Robinson. His article is sound, but he is in error if he supposes that my answer to Mr. Hall regarding the equal distribution of happiness was based entirely or mainly on the effect of sympathy upon happiness. On the contrary, my main answer was exactly Mr. Robinson's—that the aggregate of happiness is kept within very narrow limits by the immense waste and restriction of productive power involved in maintaining a compulsory inequality in the distribution of happiness. Besides, Mr. Robinson appeals to sympathy himself when he admits that his argument falls once it be supposed that the parties concerned are so unsympathetic as to find their greatest happiness in killing.

One or two plays have recently failed in New York, and the majority of the critics are moralizing about the passing of the "problem play" of the school of Ibsen, Pinero, Sudermann, and Hauptmann. But Hillary Bell, in deploring the failure of one of the plays, declares that the public taste has been so depraved by the problem plays that it no longer appreciates true art. It follows, then, that in his view the unsuccessful play has no "problem," and that the public turned away from it because of this fact. Apparently the critics cannot agree as to what a problem play is. How much value attaches to their moralizing and interpretations of the popular attitude may easily be inferred from this.

The editor of the "Voice," whose tendency to "smartness," in the newspaper sense, often leads him to offend against common sense, abuses the Germans for their opposition to puritanical Sunday laws. "Little Germany," he says, threatens "us" with war, meaning by "little Germany," as he explains, those Germans "who have left their fatherland and come to this fair country to instruct us in 'der brinciples' of personal liberty." He is very indignant over the success of the Germans in dictating legislation, and uses this rather intemperate and coarse (even for a Prohibitionist) language: "If a lot of beer-swilling tanks from across the sea can come here and enforce their demand that communities must be compelled to have ginmills whether they want them or not, is it not about time for American citizens to rise up in defence of civic liberty as opposed to so-called personal liberty? . . . When, oh, when, shall we have political leaders, editors of metropolitan dailies, and chaplains of congress firing the American heart against the insolent threats of the unterrified and unwashed Anarchists from foreign lands who can hardly read the English language?" In the name of sense, excited "Voice," what are you talking about? You show more ignorance and insolence and stupidity in these mouthings than do those you denounce as beer-swilling tanks. This is a country where the majority is said to rule. The Germans are "American citizens," and have as much right as you have to dictate legislation. They threaten no war except "political war,"—exactly what *you* are threatening the old parties with. They have votes, and the politicians need them. The fact that they have more votes than you, and therefore more political power, is very unfortunate for *you*, but you must submit and "lump it," if you are loyal to American principles. Your pretence of upholding *the* American principle is humbug pure and simple. The American principle is government by the majority, and, if you don't like the ways and ideas of the Germans, Irish, French, Scandinavians, and others who constitute the majority, you can "leave the country." You must swallow a dose of the medicine you are so anxious to force down other people's throats. Do it gracefully, then.

The attitude of the New York "Sun" and "Commercial Advertiser" toward the Loud bill providing for the curtailment of some of the privileges of newspaper and book publishers is very surprising. While the "Sun" pretends to doubt the fact that the post office loses money on newspapers, it declares that, assuming this to be true, rates should promptly be raised to the point where the publishers would cease to be beneficiaries of the government. If a paper cannot afford to pay for carriage, it should wind up and go out of business, says the "Commercial Advertiser." This is in striking contrast with the rot of the majority of newspapers, which denounce the bill as an attempt to restrict the dissemination of intelligence and to attack the freedom of the press. If postal rates should be raised on newspapers, the postal monopoly would soon find itself without ardent supporters, and the demand for competition in the carrying of letters would receive new support in many quarters. Business men would perceive the folly of a government monopoly of the letter-carrying business, and the newspapers would attack the abuses and absurdities of governmental management with greater vigor and freedom. At present gratitude restrains them somewhat. The justice of the "Sun's" position is not impaired by the probability that it is inspired solely by spite against the "World," which favors the newspaper privilege and greatly benefits by it in the circulation of its bulky almanac and sundry special issues.

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., FEBUARY 22, 1896.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Mr. Salter's "Anarchy or Government."

It is a pleasure to review such a book as Mr. Salter's, to which reference has already been made in Liberty. Mr. Salter is fair-minded and clear. He endeavors to be scientific and to rest his case on rational grounds. He is neither sentimental or metaphysically transcendental. Relying on logical weapons, he will doubtless be glad to be attacked with similar weapons.

Mr. Salter attempts to refute the position of philosophical, individualist Anarchism. While he says much that appears to be extremely favorable to it, the critical reader perceives nevertheless that he considers that social philosophy to be wholly unsound from the true ethical or sociological point of view. It will be my aim to establish, in this review, that Mr. Salter totally fails to make out his case. His argument is most weak where it should be most strongly supported, and he not only fails to state correctly the side against which he argues, but allows himself to ignore facts of the most potent character. Moreover, he makes several fundamental assumptions without the slenderest logical warrant, and expects us to accept deductions based solely on these question-begging propositions.

Having said so much by way of indicating my judgment of the matter, I proceed to consider Mr. Salter's argument, chapter by chapter and section by section.

In his opening chapter Mr. Salter states "the idea of Anarchy and the idea of government." He is logical enough to admit that government necessarily implies the idea of aggression, enforced coöperation. Government, he says, is "not only for those who voluntarily submit themselves to it, but for all the members of a community or society." Anarchy, on the other hand, "is synonymous with liberty." It is not, says Mr. Salter correctly, "inconsistent with association, but only with enforced association." Unfortunately, in his next two sentences Mr. Salter falls into a grave error, misrepresenting the Anarchistic position with regard to the question of aggression. He does it indirectly, by saying that Anarchy means "a state of society in which no one is bound or obliged to do anything (whether to associate with others or anything else)," and, further, that under Anarchy "individuals would simply be left free to do as they choose"; that "compulsion would disappear"; and that "the only bonds in society would be moral bonds." This describes, not Anarchism, but Tolstoism, so-called Christian Anarchism or non-resistance. How Mr. Salter, who has manifestly fitted himself for his task by a careful study of the literature of philosophical Anarchism, could have completely overlooked a point thoroughly elucidated and frequently discussed, I am unable to explain. Let him consult "Instead of a Book," and he will find that Anarchy is defined, not as absence of all physical compulsion, but absence of physical compulsion of the *non-aggressive*. Individuals would *not* be left to do as they choose. They would be left to do as they choose only within certain limits,—those of equal freedom. Criminals or invaders would be restrained or punished by the voluntary organizations for defence, and only non-aggressive persons would be exempt from interference. In other words, Anarchy is synonymous with liberty for *all*, not with liberty for some; and non-resistance would mean a state in which some could aggress upon others without any danger of physical punishment.

Mr. Salter will doubtless perceive the distinction without difficulty, and admit that his definition is radically defective. Owing to this defect, almost the whole of the second chapter, devoted to illustrating "the possibility of Anarchy," is essentially irrelevant to the discussion. Mr. Salter shows that people with good morals can dispense with government, and that all of our best thinkers have freely admitted that government is unnecessary to men who spontaneously do justice. Since, however, the real question is whether government is necessary for *im*perfect societies, in which crime *does* exist, this kind of evidence is immaterial. It is true that, towards the end of the chapter, Mr. Salter refers to a number of cases where voluntary organization proved sufficient to punish crime and prevent aggression, and speaks of these cases as illustrations of Anarchy. But this is clearly inconsistent with the definition of Anarchism given by him in the first chapter, as well as with the implication of the illustrations involving the condition of absolute goodness and order.

Mr. Salter refers with mild approval to the suggestion "of competition between governments" and the abolition of police monopolies. He admits that it "might be an ideal arrangement if, in the same territory, we could have a choice of governments" and "were bound to none of them," but is inclined to regard the idea as somewhat fanciful. "Voluntary government may be even a contradiction in terms," he remarks. Yes, it certainly is a contradiction in terms, but the difficulty is of Mr. Salter's own making. The organizations in question would not be voluntary governments (since government is an organization which coerces the non-invasive into membership and allegiance), but simply voluntary associations for purposes of defence. Between *these* and liberty there is certainly no incongruity, always remembering that by liberty is meant equal liberty, liberty for all.

In the third chapter Mr. Salter states "the problem of government." Restraint being an evil at best, he thinks that the abstract presumption may be said to be in favor of liberty and against the method of government. Since government coerces all, regardless of whether they have aggressed or not, the question is: "How far may a community or society use force in attaining its objects?" As Mr. Salter is a governmentalist himself, we may expect that his discussion will supply a definite answer to this question from his own point of view. He does, indeed, proceed to discuss and balance the advantages and disadvantages of government and Anarchy in a variety of situations and relations. The method may properly be called in question. It seems to me that Mr. Salter ought to have dealt first with the theoretical bases of the two systems. The important question is whether Anarchy is just and possible, and *a priori* considerations should precede the presentation of alleged facts tending to throw light upon it. But let us follow Mr. Salter.

In the fourth chapter he takes up the question of "Anarchy or Government in Defensive War," and arrives at the conclusion that it is not ethically wrong for the community (or, logically speaking, for the majority) to coerce individuals into coöperation for defence against external enemies. He supposes that one tribe attacks another, and that resistance is necessary for the preservation of the aggressed-upon. How shall they resist? he asks. "Shall the reluctant and unwilling be forced to join the majority and made to fight, or must we say, on the contrary, that every individual's freedom is so sacred that it is wrong to do violence to it, and that non-interference must be practised, even if it leads to the ruin of the tribe?" His answer is:

> I think every one would feel that a claim in behalf of freedom like the one just mentioned is strained and exaggerated, and that an individual could not really ask to do as he liked, save as he was ready to act in a way not inconsistent with the interests of his tribe. Probably conscience itself, in one who was thus cowardly and unwilling, would be on the side of those who forced him into the ranks (or to labor, at home); at least it would not be strongly against them.

The reader will doubtless be amazed to hear that this is substantially *all* Mr. Salter has to say in support of his view that Anarchy fails in defensive war and that coercion of the unwilling—government, in short—is justifiable under the condition supposed. That a philosophical writer and ethical teacher should be satisfied with such pseudo-reasoning is really astonishing. In the first place, "what every one would feel" is not an absolute and invariable criterion of soundness. To appeal to the feelings of "every one" is to abdicate the function of philosopher and logical truth-seeker. Mr. Salter's book was not written to inform us what "every one feels," but to solve, in a scientific manner, without assuming anything, certain fundamental questions. *Why* does "every one" feel as Mr. Salter says he does? Is this feeling right, rational, or is it the product of past practices and false teachings? We expect Mr. Salter to answer this by going back of the fact itself and accounting for its existence. In the second place, I emphatically deny that "every one would feel" as Mr. Salter

says. He himself instances the case of the Quakers in a subsequent paragraph, and admits that there is general sympathy among the finer elements with their conscientious scruples against war. To Quakers he will have to add other non-resistants as well as philosophical Anarchists. The latter, to be sure, do not look on war as a thing to which everything else is preferable, but they certainly insist that it is an unwarrantable interference with individual liberty to force an inoffensive man into the ranks and compel him to fight for the safety of the country in which he resides.

Let us analyze this proposition, taking the most extreme case possible. Suppose the danger is not merely that invaders may subjugate the invaded and set up their own government in place of the one defeated and dethroned (even Mr. Salter will concede that an American has the right to say that he would rather be under English rule than under American, and that the prospect of conquest of America by England does not appal him and by no means involves the destruction of the American people), but that the entire population will be massacred. Suppose that the majority of the invaded are up in arms, ready to defend themselves, but that a minority decline to participate in the defensive campaign. This clearly signifies that the minority are ready to die and unwilling to fight for life. Mr. Salter cannot deny them the right to commit suicide or to get themselves killed. But, if their own lives are of no value to them, why should they fight for the lives of others? If the majority, without the coöperation of the minority, are able to repel the invaders, well and good; if they are not, there is no help for them. They certainly cannot rationally say to the minority: "You must defend the tribe,—that is, *us*, the majority,—even if you care nothing about your own lives." Such a contention implies that the minority are the slaves of the majority, and not independent, sovereign individuals.

Furthermore, when we descend to practical life, we find that Mr. Salter's position really involves this,—that, whenever the majority *think* the tribe is in danger, they are entitled to coerce the minority, which may vigorously protest against the majority's warlike attitude and attribute it to hysteria, folly, jingoism, or sham patriotism, into coöperation for alleged defence. In other words, the majority first decides that the tribe is in danger and war necessary, and then proceeds to force the protesting minority into the ranks. I utterly deny that "every one feels" this to be perfectly right and ethical and philosophical.

Mr. Salter continues:

> Moreover, suppose that the tribe, in the case under consideration, instead of being defeated, succeeds in its resistance, despite the cowardice and lack of patriotism of a few. [How prone the governmentalist is to assume that only cowardice and lack of patriotism impel men to decline to go to war!—V. Y.] Does it seem right, in such circumstances, that persons should share in the blessings of continued security who have done nothing to bring them about (though they might have helped to this end)? If men are to have blessings, may they not, in the name of right itself, be expected to bear their share of the social burden in securing them?

With regard to the last query, it may be stated generally that whether or not men are to be expected to help pay for blessings depends entirely upon whether or not they want and ask such blessings. If Mr. Salter, in pursuit of his own happiness and without any negotiations with his neighbors, builds a beautiful residence, he cannot rightfully ask his neighbors to pay him something for the blessing he confers on them. They enjoy his residence, and derive economic and moral advantages from its presence "in their midst," but they obtain them *gratis*, simply because they had not entered into any contract with Mr. Salter and had not agreed to pay for the blessing. He built his residence for his own needs and comfort, not for those of his neighbors, and for the indirect benefits conferred upon them he can expect no compensation.

Mr. Salter will assent to this, I have no doubt. But, if he does, he is also bound to conclude that "continued security" may be innocently and properly enjoyed by persons who have done nothing to bring it about. Those who fight invaders fight for their own lives, liberties, and possessions, and success means to them the attainment of desired results. Indirectly they may benefit others, but for such indirect benefit no return can be legitimately demanded. There is nothing "wrong" in our enjoying benefits which indirectly flow from actions or things which were never designed for or solicited by us.

We thus see that Mr. Salter has totally failed to prove that government is justified in defensive warfare. In fact, he has not even stopped to consider the Anarchistic position on this point. He has assumed something which is not true, and which would be irrelevant even if it were true. He has not established the right of government to coerce men for purposes of defensive war.

The next subject taken up by Mr. Salter is "Anarchy or Government in Protecting Life and Property." Most writers, he says, have no reasoning to offer in support of the proposition that government may, and ought to, protect life and property from internal aggression; they take it for granted. This is unquestionably true, but Mr. Salter errs greatly when he goes on to say that even Spencer "seems almost as implicitly as any schoolboy to take for granted that government should protect life and property." Spencer has not omitted to adduce evidence and reasons for his position. We may deem them insufficient and weak, but we cannot justly allege that he has assumed the point in question. Mr. Salter, for his own part, believes that here, too, government is necessary and justified. We shall see what his reasons are, and what their degree of cogency is, in another article. V. Y.

Is Government Justified by Experience?

They say that Anarchism is an unpractical theory, because it lacks the confirmation of experience; it has never been tried. Is it not obvious that opposition to Anarchism rests on the same purely theoretical basis? If there is no known instance of Anarchy working well in a civilized community, neither is there any instance of its working badly. Those who assert that it would work badly are compelled to base their arguments merely on their abstract ideas of what is to be expected from human nature, simply because civilized history affords no other foundation for an argument on either side of this question.

Why, then, should it be a reproach to one side only in this dispute that we have no experimental foundation for our beliefs as to the probable working of Anarchy? Where one of two propositions has long been tried, and its alternative never, is the presumption in favor of the old system strong enough to make us quite certain that the new ought not to be introduced, however superior it may seem in theory? Surely not, for we have examples of absolutely new social theories which were tried at last and immediately won general approval where they were tried. It is no disgrace to any movement to be condemned by a test that also, in their day, condemned the movements for the abolition of slavery and the separation of church and State. If the tree of theoretical innovation, having borne such fruits as these, is now found corrupt at the root, it must have rotted very lately.

Some do try to make out an argument from experience against Anarchism by saying that men originally lived without government, and the fact that they have now adopted government proves that they must originally have found it advantageous. I wish these historians of the prehistoric time could receive a little attention from those who are so fond of berating Anarchists for "looking back to an imaginary ideal past." Herbert Spencer says that government was originally a temporary war measure, like the Roman dictatorship, and that its extension to times of peace is the result of usurpations—embezzlements of power—by the war-chiefs. This may be a bold attempt to reconstruct an inaccessible past with scanty materials, but at least it is based on a good deal of study and thought. Can the same be claimed for the theory that government originates from experience proving it to be an essential condition of prosperity?

We have reports of Anarchic savage tribes at the present day, the Eskimos being best known; but these reports furnish little material for generalization. One fact only is conspicuous,—that these tribes either will not fight or are unable to hold their own against neighboring tribes; therefore they have been driven out of the most desirable territory into such as is not worth stealing, and consequently they are poor. It seems a safe inference that in the savage state government is necessary to military success, and military success is necessary to economic prosperity. Yet we may say here that the term "savage state" connotes inability to form a permanent voluntary defensive association as well as inability to build a railroad. I know of no evidence that the permanent voluntary defensive association was ever invented among savages; therefore I do not see how savage experience can be quoted to show that it would not be an adequate substitute for government in foreign war.

As to the supposed necessity of government to maintain internal order, it does not appear to be so among savages. Crime is almost unknown among many of the Anarchic tribes; and, even where this is not so, the people seem to get along with each other as well as in governed tribes of similar criminal propensities.

Beyond this there seems to be no safe generalization regarding the Anarchic races. Furthermore, the accounts of such races deserve

to be regarded with suspicion, not only on the general principle that most travellers lack the brains necessary for a correct understanding and description of strange institutions,—the stories carried home by English visitors to America are proverbial, and the case must be twenty times worse where the visited nation is twenty times more foreign and twenty times less respected,—but also because it is commonly considered disgraceful for a people to have no government, and thus those who hate or despise any tribe have a direct motive for believing and saying, as an expression of their hate or contempt, that it lives in Anarchy. An instance of this is furnished by the best-hated race on earth,—the Bushmen. We are always told that they have absolutely no government; yet close by this statement I find others which show clearly that they have tyrannical government, not only in the Anarchist sense which includes private crime, but in the popular sense which restricts the word to the conduct of public affairs.

A summary of savage experience, then, as seen to-day and as inferable in the case of our remote ancestors, shows us that government is more efficient in foreign war than any other form of society known to savages; that efficiency in foreign war is quite necessary to national prosperity under savage conditions, because it is the only way of retaining the use of good land; and that government is positively not required for the maintenance of internal order in a savage tribe. It gives no reason for asserting that government is necessary for any purpose except war.

How far does the difference between savage and civilized environment make these conclusions inapplicable to our life? At one point, certainly, this difference is vital to the argument. Defeat in war, where both parties are civilized, never involves the driving away of the inhabitants of the conquered territory.* Therefore a civilized nation cannot have the same reason as a savage nation for considering warlike power as necessary to prosperity. If it is asserted that civilized nations need fighting power for other reasons, which savages do not feel, it may be replied with at least equal probability of truth that civilized man can, at need, replace government as a fighting machine with other forms of organization, unknown or impracticable to savages. On the other hand, while it is not to the point to show that civilized men need order more than savages do (for the demonstration was that, according to savage experience, no more order is to be had by government than without it), yet it may fairly and plausibly be claimed that civilized government preserves order more effectively than that of savages, and therefore offers an advantage over Anarchy, as savage government does not. Anarchists, of course, reply that civilized men have more effective means than savages for preserving order without government. But, when we come to weigh the merits of these two claims, we are decidedly off the ground of experience.

Savage experience, then, which is the only existing experience of Anarchy, gives no results that are conclusive as to its working in civilized society, if tried. We are left to theoretical considerations for our arguments both for and against the idea, unless civilized experience can help us out.

Now, is is true that the civilized world has no experience of Anarchy. But it has more recorded experience of government than of anything else on earth; and this experience allows of certain generalizations. As to what these generalizations are, hear the words of Prof. Albion W. Small, of the University of Chicago. He cannot be charged with a fanatical bias in favor of individualism, for he writes:

> The town which does not to-day own or control its gas, electric lights, water supply, and street railway lights, is presumably a town of low grade, both in economic intelligence and in civic virtue.

Yet, on another page of the same number of his magazine, criticising an argument on the relative advantages of Anarchy—real Anarchy—and government, he sums up the results of our experience in these words:

> The conclusion properly to be drawn from a survey of present conditions is, then, that this system of *restraint—government*—cannot be said to work well, but that the world somehow gets along under it.

I have copied italics and all. In its original context the proposition is given a broad application, covering the entire field of the effect of government on industry. The only modification it needs is to give it a broader application, covering every other field on which government lays its hand; for it is just as universally obvious that "government does not work well" in religion or morality as in industry. And it is most obvious of all in the working of the great machine of government itself. No other great interest in the country can even approach it in badness of management, unless it be the railroads; and the greatest scandals even of the railroads commonly relate to their connection with government. Furthermore, though railroads seem always to have existed, because they have existed since we were born, they are in fact so very new an invention that the fact gives a complete excuse for our not yet having learned to manage their business. But government is run on the basis of an experience as old as history, during all which time it has remained the greatest scandal in the world. Two other scandals have perhaps temporarily surpassed it,—the church during a part of the Middle Ages, and the Arab slave-trade of our own day; but I do not think so in either case. The slave-trade of past times was altogether the creature of settled government. With these two exceptions, each for a comparatively short time, I am not much afraid that many sober people will deny the correctness of my statement that government has always been the greatest scandal in the world.

As to the statement that "the world somehow gets along under it," we have to acknowledge, not only that men exist under it, but that what we know as civilization (so called because we never saw anything more civilized) exists under it.

If, then, according to notorious facts, government is and always has been the greatest scandal of the world at large and of each nation in particular, with scattered temporary exceptions, and the greatest other scandals have commonly been closely connected with government, and have been most scandalous as they were most closely connected with it, and yet civilized society (according to the present standard of civilization) exists under it, do these facts give us an empirical basis for any conclusions as to the desirability of abolishing government?

Certainly they give one strong presumption,—that, if civilized men continued to exist after the abolition of government, they would supply its place (so far as that seemed necessary) with something less scandalous. They have proved themselves able to manage everything else better than they manage government. If experience can prove any such thing, it proves that we cannot permanently manage government well. It is sometimes said to be well managed during a short spurt of reform; yet even then, in many cases at least, the management only seems good by contrast with the abuses which precede and follow. In the face of all this experience, it is the most unreasonable optimism to expect that good government (by which I here mean government as well managed as the principal private businesses of the same country at the same time) will ever be established and maintained anywhere on earth. This experience covers almost all imaginable forms of government,—all have been tried, and all have failed, some worse than others, but none good,—but it covers no attempt by civilized men to provide without government for those social needs which are so poorly met by government. Such an attempt will some day be made; and then, as all our other works have succeeded better than government, so will this. At least, this is the reasonable presumption. It may turn out that the impracticability is not in the machine, but in the workers or in the work to be done. But, if we assume this before trying every experiment that could lead to a different conclusion, we are confessing failure before we have exhausted the possibilities of success.

There remains one other point of experience,—that civilized society can exist under government. We know from savage experience that industrial society can exist without government; but as to whether civilized society can exist without government, experience says neither yes or no. That is where the shoe pinches,—the dreadful possibility that civilized men might become uncivilized if they were left without government. It is ridiculously improbable, to be sure; yet, so long as the experiment has never been tried, this remains among the possibilities of the unknown world into which Anarchists ask society to rush. Golden, glorious possibilities are there in measureless abundance—and this one black one, which we are barely unable to prove impossible except by theory. Therefore society jerks her hand away, when we offer to lead her to the gate.

Nothing venture, nothing have, gentlemen! And, if the one black bean does turn out to be the topmost one in the jar,—if the new life is a failure, after all,—the road back is not impassable or even difficult.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Zangwill is growing more and more indiscreet and audacious. He knows something about literature, but, when he sits in judgment

* The expulsion of the Mormons from Missouri and Illinois, fifty-two years ago, by small civil wars, is hardly a bulky enough instance—perhaps not even recent enough—to disprove my assertion. And it did not prevent the Mormons from prospering.

upon philosophical and sociological systems, he betrays woful ignorance. He tells Grant Allen, for instance, that his observation of human life and character is "as free from subtlety as the Spencerian philosophy which is Mr. Allen's fetish." Here we have two statements,—that Grant Allen is a blind worshipper of Spencer, and that the Spencerian philosophy is superficial. Now, everybody who knows what is going on in the reform world has at least heard that Grant Allen has joined the Fabians and become a State Socialist. His views on economics, politics, and marriage are in direct opposition to those of Spencer, and there is hardly anything in Spencer's philosophy which Grant Allen now accepts. Here Zangwill is guilty of ignorance of notorious facts. As for the alleged absence of subtlety in Spencerian philosophy, it would be absurd for anybody familiar with the same to stop to argue with Zangwill. He is out of court. There is nothing to show that he has any notion of what he is talking about.

John Morley, Sir William Vernon Harcourt, and H. M. Stanley are some of the latest additions to the number of Englishmen who counsel their country to do what Mr. Yarros says it cannot do consistently with self-respect,—*viz.*, submit the Venezuelan question in its entirety to arbitration,—and T. B. Wakeman, Van Buren Denslow, and William M. Salter are among the progressive elements on this side of the ocean now camping on the ground where I, it has been said, was without progressive company.

Another Bad Citizen.

To the Editor of Liberty:

You may be interested to know that I was yesterday excused, or rather "disqualified," from acting as a juror in court of common pleas No. 1 of this city on gronnds not new to you, but doubtless new to the Philadelphia courts.

Being summoned before Judges Biddle and Beitler to serve as a juryman, I respectfully informed them that I must have the privilege of construing for myself, not only the facts, but the law as well, and also that I would not under any circumstances assist in enforcing any law which I should consider unjust.

Judge Biddle, remarking on the strangeness of a citizen's setting himself up to be wiser than the law, and intimating that I was not a good citizen, then consulted with Judge Beitler.

I was then informed that, holding the opinions which I professed conscientiously, I was certainly "disqualified from acting as a good citizen." Without reply to this unjust sneer, I took my departure.

Yours truly,

SAMUEL MILLIKEN.

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY 18, 1896.

Scruples.

[Octave Mirbeau in Le Journal.]

Last night I was sleeping soundly, when I was suddenly awakened by a loud noise,—something like the fall of a piece of furniture in the next room. At the same time the clock struck four, and my cat began to mew pitifully. I sprang out of bed, and quickly, without precautions, with a courage explained only by the ardor of my conservative convictions, I opened the door and entered the room. It was lighted, and the first thing that I saw was a very elegant gentleman, in evening dress, and decorated withal, who was occupied in stuffing valuable articles into a pretty bag made of yellow leather. The bag did not belong to me, but the valuable articles were my own; so that this seemed to me a contradictory and unseemly operation against which I was disposed to protest. Although I did not know this gentleman at all, he had a face which was familiar to me,—such a face as one meets on the boulevards, at the theatre, in the night restaurants, one of those correct and well-groomed faces which prompt you to say of those to whom they belong: "He must be a club man!" To pretend that I was not in the least astonished to see in my house, at four o'clock in the morning, a gentleman in evening dress and whom I had not invited to come, would be an exaggeration. But this astonishment was not accompanied by any other feeling, such as fright or anger,—of the sort which these nocturnal visits ordinarily inspire. This club man's air of elegance and good humor had directly reassured me, for I must confess that I had not expected to see such a person, but feared rather that I might find myself face to face with a horrible brute of a burglar and should be obliged to undertake against him acts of defensive violence for which I feel no inclination, and concerning which one does not always know how they will end.

Seeing me, the elegant stranger interrupted his labor, and, with a smile of benevolent irony, he said to me:

"Excuse me, sir, for having awakened you so impolitely. But it is not altogether my fault. Truly, you have very sensitive furniture, which promptly sinks into a swoon at the slightest provocation."

Then I saw that the room was turned upside down: drawers open and emptied, glasses broken, a little desk in which I keep my valuables and family jewels piteously overturned on the carpet. In short, a real pillage! And while I was taking this in, my too early visitor continued, in his well-modulated voice:

"Oh! this modern furniture! What a fragile soul it has! I believe that it also is afflicted with the disease of the century,—that, like everybody, it has neurasthenia."

He uttered a slight laugh, discreet and charming, which did not offend me, and which revealed, upon the whole, a man of superior education. I decided to intervene.

"To whom have I the honor of speaking?" said I, following with a less anxious look the operations of the nocturnal visitor, while a draft, produced by the open doors, caused my nightshirt to flap ridiculously.

"Oh! sir," answered this perfect gentleman in an easy tone, "perhaps my name would, at the present moment, give you too great a surprise. Besides, do you not think it better to reserve for a less peculiar occasion an introduction which I hope may not be long delayed, and which, moreover, I confess to you, I did not at all seek to-day. I would like, with your permission, to preserve the strictest *incognito*."

"Be it so, sir. But all this does not explain to me" . . .

"My presence in your house at so extraordinary an hour, and this disorder?"

"Exactly. And I should be pleased to" . . .

"Naturally," acquiesced the elegant stranger. "Your curiosity is very legitimate, and I have no intention of evading it. But, pardon me; since it is your desire that we engage in a little conversation, don't you think it would be prudent to slip on a dressing-gown? Your *déshabillé* distresses me. It is cold here, and one quickly gets the grip in these strange times."

"You are right. Pray, then, excuse me for a moment."

"Certainly, sir, certainly."

I went to my dressing-room, where I quickly put on a dressing-gown, after which I returned to my stranger, who, during my short absence, had endeavored to restore a little of the order which his operations had disturbed.

"Never mind that, sir, never mind that, I beg of you. My *valet de chambre* will put things to rights to-morrow."

I offered him a seat, took one myself, and then, having lighted a cigar, I said to him in a tone of encouragement:

"Sir, I am listening."

The club man might have collected himself, as all the heroes of fiction do before telling their stories. He avoided this banality, and began directly:

"Sir, I am a robber, a professional robber,—say the word, if you will,—a burglar. You doubtless had divined it."

"Quite so."

"That does honor to your perspicacity. So I am a robber. I decided to take this social position only after I had thoroughly satisfied myself that, in the troublous times in which we live, it is the frankest, fairest, most honest of all. Robbery, sir,—and I say robbery as I would say the bar, literature, painting, medicine,—has been a decried career, because all those who have followed it hitherto have been simply odious brutes, disgusting vagabonds, people without elegance or education. Now I hope to give it the lustre to which it is entitled, and make of robbery a liberal, honorable, and enviable career. Let us not content ourselves with words, sir, and let us view life as it is. Robbery is man's sole preoccupation. One chooses a profession—whatever it may be, observe—only because it enables him to steal—more or less—but at any rate to steal something from somebody. You have too thoughtful a mind, you know too well what is hidden behind the deceptive ornamentality of our virtues and our honor, to make it necessary for me to support my statement by convincing examples and conclusive enumerations."

These words were so flattering to me in my pretensions—justified, by the way—to psychology and to acquaintance with the social sciences that I could not help receiving them with a peremptory and superior "Evidently!" The elegant burglar, thus encouraged, continued with more confidential gestures:

"I desire to speak only of that which concerns me. Moreover, I shall be very brief. I began in commerce. But the dirty work that necessarily fell to me there, the base deceits, the false weights, quickly revolted my instinctive delicacy, my frank nature, so strongly marked by cordiality and scruple. I left commerce for finance. Finance disgusted me. Alas! I could not bring myself to launch non-existent enterprises, to issue false papers and false metals, to organize false mines, false isthmuses, false coal-fields. To think perpetually of diverting others' money to my coffers, to enrich myself by the slow and gradual ruin of my customers, thanks to the virtue of dazzling prospectuses and to the legality of marvellous combinations, was to me an unacceptable operation, which my mind, so scrupulous and so hostile to falsehood, declined to perform. Then I thought of journalism. It did not take me a month to convince myself that, unless one is willing to engage in painful and complicated blackmailing schemes, journalism does not feed its man. I tried politics" . . .

At this point I could not help bursting into a loud laugh which threatened never to stop.

"That's right!" approved the seductive gentleman. "Evidently we need say no more on that head. In brief, I thus exhausted all that public or private life can offer in the way of suitable professions and noble careers to an active, intelligent, and delicate young man, like myself. I saw clearly that robbery—by whatever name it be disguised—was the sole object and motive of all activities, but how greatly deformed and dissembled, and therefore how much more dangerous! So I reasoned in this manner: 'Since man cannot escape this fatal law of robbery, it would be much more honorable for him to practise it frankly, and not surround his natural desire to appropriate the goods of others with pompous excuses, illusory qualities, and redundant titles, whose euphemistic finery no longer deceives anybody.' Accordingly, every day I rob; I break into rich interiors at night; I take outright from another's vaults what I deem necessary to the expansion of my needs, to the development of my human personality. It takes a few hours every night, between a conversation at the club and a flirtation in the ball-room. At all other times I live as other people do. I belong to a club; I have high connections. Very recently I was decorated by the ministry. And when I have made a lucky stroke, I am capable of any generosity. In short, I do frankly and directly what everybody practises by devious twistings and ways that are the more ignominious because . . . . Well, my emancipated conscience no longer reproaches me with anything, for, of all the beings whom I know, I am the only one who has courageously conformed his acts to his ideas and hermetically adapted his nature to the mysterious significance of Life" . . .

The candles were flickering, the daylight was entering between the lattices of the blinds. I invited the elegant stranger to share my morning breakfast, but he objected that he was in evening dress, and did not wish to offend me by such a violation of the proprieties.

1940.

In those old days, my gentle friend,
Did you read Liberty?
No? Then what did you to defend
Your race, yourself, and me?

"I have a little plea to bring:
I wasn't much to blame;
I couldn't comprehend the thing,
But I thought it just the same."

W. W. G.

The Conditions of Greatest Happiness.

Mr. Bolton Hall says that he "could not show . . . that it is more important, or better, or more moral that two persons should have a certain amount of happiness rather than have the less developed one killed and the other have three times as much happiness."

This, I think, is precisely what Anarchism does pretend to show, and without any appeal to sympathy.

The idea that inequality of happiness is preferable is based upon the aristocratic feeling mingled with religious principle that some men are "more developed" than others, and that it is the function of the more developed (which is the scientific term for the righteous) to kill off the undeveloped,—that is to say, the wicked, in ancient phrase.

And they have been at it, lo! now these many years,—Briton against Ashantee; Catholic against heretic; Christian against Jew, Turk, and Infidel; Pagan against Christian,—so far back that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, each trying to kill off "the undeveloped."

At last Anarchism has come forward, saying: My dear fellows, this is an astonishing waste of energy, and, if you are so awfully developed as you think yourselves to be, can hardly be conducive to your happiness, either to that of the killer or killed.

You will find, if you think it over, that it is vain to talk of your being more developed than each other, or to settle it by trying to kill each other. The only kind of development you settle in that way is development of fighting capacity, valuable enough in its way, but not at all comprising all possible development, as I think you will be the first to admit.

Now, if you do admit it, you, the superior classes, the more developed you know,—that is to say, both of you,—will be more apt to attain three times as much happiness each, if you stop trying to emulate the Kilkenny cats, and devote yourselves each to achieving as much development as possible in the way that gives him most pleasure.

Surely you can see that, if you arrange a compact between you not to interfere with each other at all as long as each pursues his own course of developing, reserving the right of pitching in with might and main if either attempts to limit the devotion to development of the other, you have a better chance of obtaining pleasurable development for both than in any other way.

All this, I repeat, providing that killing is not the most pleasurable conceivable development for you.

But, before you enter upon this, you must take to heart that such a compact would include for each the clear right to sell his vote or his body, providing the other was as free to refrain from selling. You may also take to heart the fact that such a compact would take away from the few the power that they now have to live on the earnings of the many, and would make it unnecessary for the many to sell either their votes or their persons.

JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON.

Anarchism in Detroit.

"Yes, your theory of Anarchism is a very beautiful one, but it is not likely to be adopted for thousands of years yet, and I don't care to waste any time over theories that are practicable only so far in the future." I meet this remark frequently, and it is usually said in such a kind, condescending way,—as you would address a lunatic to combat whom seriously and logically would be to arouse him to a dangerous frenzy. When you meet such a fellow, don't spare him. Before you let up on him, make him wish that he had taken you seriously at first.

***

Some three or four years ago I was invited to address the Witenagemote club, of Detroit, a body composed of artists, architects, lawyers, and professional men generally,—a very exclusive crowd. Instead of making a set speech, I had them ask me questions, which I answered as best I could. Occasionally since, I have heard of my visit to the club, and it was pleasant to learn that a number of the gentlemen present looked with a good deal of favor upon the ideas presented during the two hours and a half of informal talk,—noticeably among them a Democratic judge of one of our leading courts. By the way, this club has no written rules, no officers, no constitution. A steward is appointed by the club, and he does all the rest,—collects the dues, buys the whiskey, tobacco, pipes, etc., pays the rent, and so on. A few evenings ago Comrade Hoetger, through the invitation of Judge Hosmer, read a paper on Anarchism before the same club. There were four recognized Anarchists present. After the paper, each one of us had a group about him informally answering questions and combatting arguments. I was pleased to learn from himself that Capt. Gardner, of the regular army, stationed at Fort Wayne, just below this city, dated his interest in the social-economic movement from the evening I first visited the club. He has been a great reader of the subject since, and was of valuable assistance to me in answering questions at the last meeting.

***

It has got to be somewhat of a fad in Detroit for the exclusive and aristocratic clubs, as well as the plebeian clubs, to have Anarchists expound their doctrines to them. It was my pleasure to appear before the Bohemian club, which meets in the Unitarian church parlors, a few months ago. Fully half of those present were ladies, many of them the most prominent in society and intellectual circles. The reports from this meeting are encouraging, indeed.

***

On the evening of December 23 I read a paper on Anarchism before the Onward club. This club is composed of members of the Plymouth Tabernacle, a Congregational church under the pastorage of Morgan Wood, a progressive young minister who is doing much to liberalize the thousands who flock to his church every Sunday. The Onward club meets in the church parlors, and on the evening of my talk a banquet was had. The following is what Prof. Raymond had to say about it in "The Kingdom," a paper published in Minneapolis in the interest of the School of the Kingdom, Christian social scientists:

Plymouth church, Detroit, has recently entertained two gatherings of the very greatest significance, as indicating a tendency toward the obliteration of class lines. . . . The second meeting referred to was the regular monthly banquet of the Onward club, held Monday, December 23. This club is an organization comprising over sixty men,—members and non-members of the church. Its meetings are held every two weeks for social and intellectual recreation. The club during the ensuing winter is to be addressed by some of the leading ministers of different denominations of the city, Congregational, Universalist, Episcopalian, Unitarian, and Jewish, and by some of the leaders in municipal and social reform in Detroit. On the evening in question the after-dinner address was made by Mr. Joseph A. Labadie, who is known as one of the most intelligent philosophical Anarchists in the country. He discussed at some length the question: "What is philosophical Anarchy?" It is difficult to see how more could have been made of this subject, which was clearly and fairly presented. At the close of Mr. Labadie's address a very spirited and intelligent discussion, lasting over an hour, was indulged in by the members and guests of the club. Such a gathering must be rare in the annals of the modern Christian church, as an analysis of its *personnel* will show. There were present the Christian minister; several representatives of the school of philosophical Anarchy; a number of advocates of State Socialism (Anarchy's antithesis), among whom was the Socialist candidate for mayor at the last municipal election; the orthodox Calvinist; the practical business man; the doctor; a leader of the Coxey movement, who piloted two hundred commonwealers from Spokane Falls to Washington, D. C.; the lawyer; a leading representative of the Detroit press; the Christian Socialist; trade-unionists, clerks, mechanics, and day-laborers.

The significance of such a gathering in such a place and at such a time can hardly be overestimated. An Anarchist in a Christian church receiving a respectful and attentive hearing from a club composed largely of Christian men, and his views meeting with such intelligent and tolerant discussion, surely constituted an event in the history of both organized (?) Anarchy and organized Christianity. While it is not known that the meeting resulted in any conversion to Anarchy, still the larger result was attained that not a few on either side of the question witnessed many a prejudice removed. Members of the church expressed surprise at some of the fine sentiments of the speaker, and Mr. Labadie himself voiced his appreciation of the opportunity granted him to state his views. Neither philosophical Anarchy nor the church can any more arraign each other in the unqualified terms they have been wont to use. Expression took the place of suppression, tolerance of ignorance and bigotry, fellowship of mutual suspicion; and another was added to the signs of the approaching Kingdom.

***

Nowhere that I speak can the questioners refrain from asking about Anarchism. At the Brewster chapel, before the Brewster Men's club, where I spoke on trade unions, a good opportunity presented itself of giving information as to what Anarchism is. The meeting was presided over by a judge of the Wayne circuit court. Before the meeting closed the questions led me into the discussion of free trade, free land, mutual banking, and the abolition of patent rights.

***

Wherever I go, there is now a desire to know what we want and how we propose to get it, and nowhere yet have I met anything but the most respectful hearing and cordial treatment. I have made it a point to insist that Anarchism is purely negative in its philosophy, that it lays down no arbitrary rules for the "reconstruction" of society and the guidance of those who come after us. Anarchism begins and ends in *liberty*. I might say that Anarchism is the science of liberty, as well as its practice. What people shall do with their liberty after they get it is no concern of ours. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether celibacy or monogamy or polygamy or polyandry or promiscuity shall prevail, Anarchism does not know and cannot be dogmatic about. These questions must be settled by the science of economy, criminology, sexology, etc. This method of presenting Anarchism, it seems to me, frees it of ambiguity and reduces it to its essence. It relieves it of the burden of furnishing a cure for every conceivable ill that does or may afflict mankind; the ills that liberty cannot cure cannot be cured. It does not put us under the necessity of defending either individualism or communism. It simply gives us more power to deny and combat the right of *Authority*. This, and this only, is Anarchism's enemy, is Anarchism's antithesis, is Anarchism's implacable foe.

JOSEPH A. LABADIE.

Why Pentecost is Not in Sing Sing.

Some months ago I printed in Liberty the simple statement that Hugh O. Pentecost had been indicted for grand larceny. A subscriber to Liberty, whom apparently Pentecost's shameful denial of his past had failed to cure of hero-worship, wrote to me, demanding that I print the evidence. As there was then no evidence to print, I could not well comply. But since that time the case has taken its legal course and is now closed. Accordingly I print an account of the affair from beginning to end, as given in the New York "Herald" recently, and trust that it may remove from the mind of my correspondent any lingering illusion that Pentecost differs materially from other common criminals. It should be remembered, in reading the account, that Pentecost, as a member of Tammany, is under its protection, and that, so far as the district attorney's office is concerned, Tammany is still in power.

The recent acquittal of Nicolai Weiss by a jury in the court of general sessions was the closing incident in one of the most remarkable events in the history of the district attorney's office.

Weiss had accused Hugh O. Pentecost and Richard H. Gatling, lawyers, of No. 737 Broadway, of having stolen from him $1,000 worth of property. Police detectives entrapped Weiss and Schulz, immediately after Mr. Pentecost had paid Schulz $280. Schulz said he had merely collected what was due to Weiss. Mr. Pentecost declared that Schulz had extorted the $280 from him by promising to send Weiss out of the country. Indictments were found against Weiss and

Schulz. Both men were triumphantly acquitted. Meantime, while Weiss lay in the Tombs awaiting trial, the indictments for larceny against Pentecost and Gatling had been dismissed.

Weiss was formerly a watchmaker and repairer for Tiffany & Co. He is a Russian of German descent, and he has much difficulty in speaking English. His wife was sick, and he was short of money about two years ago. He pawned a watch belonging to Tiffany & Co. and got $25 on it. When he thought the watch would be called for, he redeemed it and pawned another. He was detected shortly after he had redeemed the second watch, and pawned a third. Weiss was arrested, and Tiffany & Co. prosecuted him vigorously.

He wrote to Hugh O. Pentecost asking him to act as his counsel. Richard H. Gatling called, instead of his partner, Mr. Pentecost, and consulted with the prisoner. Weiss says it was not until long afterward that he learned Gatling's name, as he believed he was Pentecost. As the proof against Weiss was very clear, his counsel advised him to plead guilty. Weiss says that Mr. Pentecost promised to have sentence suspended, if he would promise to leave this country. Having no money, Weiss refused to make the promise. He pleaded guilty, and Judge Martine sentenced him to one year in the penitentiary.

Tiffany & Co. learned the whole story of Weiss's difficulties, after he had served six months of his term. Members of the firm interceded with Governor Morton, and the watchmaker was soon pardoned. Upon being released, Weiss called on Pentecost & Gatling, and, as he later testified, offered to pay part of their fee for acting as their counsel. While in prison awaiting trial, he had signed some sort of paper, giving the lawyers control of his watchmaking tools, which, he testified, cost him $1,000, and of his furniture, which cost $300. The lawyers told him they had sold all the property, claiming that the paper he signed was a bill of sale, giving them absolute ownership of it. Weiss said then, and he has ever since testified upon his various examinations, that, when he signed the paper, Gatling told him it was merely a chattel mortgage, and that they would use the tools and furniture to raise money for his defence. They told him they would see what could be done for him.

Weiss swears that he called twenty times at the office of Pentecost & Gatling within three weeks, but failed to get any satisfaction. Mr. Pentecost went with him to the shops of various dealers in watchmaking tools, and learned that the outfit Weiss owned was worth between $500 and $1,000. The watchmaker at last wrote to Mr. Pentecost, saying that, if a proper settlement was not made, he would complain to the grand jury. Shortly after this, the two men met in the criminal court building, and Mr. Pentecost accused Weiss of trying to blackmail him. Weiss denied the charge, and called on Assistant District Attorney Allen, who presents cases to the grand jury for its investigation and action. Mr. Allen told him he had no case, and sent him away.

By this time the story of Weiss, his crime, his punishment, and his unfortunate experience in losing his tools, had become talked about in the jewelry trade. Max L. Lissauer, a wealthy manufacturing jeweller, of No. 12 Maiden lane, thus heard of it. He had Weiss summoned before the grand jury, where the man told all that happened to him. Some one in the district attorney's office sent for Pentecost and Gatling and they told their side of the case fully. In spite of this, the grand jury, on June 28 last, found indictments for larceny against Hugh O. Pentecost and Richard H. Gatling. The lawyers surrendered themselves to the district attorney, and were promptly admitted to $1,000 bail, which they furnished forthwith and went free.

Weiss thought he would soon obtain satisfaction, but he was doomed to disappointment. Somehow the cases of the people against Pentecost and Gatling never came up for trial. Sometimes they were on the calendar, but they developed a knack of disappearing. Several times the assistant district attorney assigned to prosecute found that he was not ready or that somebody was ill.

Weiss was eager for a chance to go to work at his trade. Thanks to Mr. Tiffany's kindness, he was employed by A. W. Harrington, of the Charles Jacques Clock Company. He borrowed money from Charles A. Schulz, who had a private detective bureau at No. 121 Hudson street. Schulz undertook to collect what he could from Pentecost & Gatling. He wrote a letter to Mr. Pentecost, and made arrangements for an interview.

They had several meetings. Mr. Pentecost says that Schulz offered to send Weiss out of the country for a bribe of $280. Schulz says that Mr. Pentecost offered to pay him $280 for Weiss as Weiss's "equity" in the missing tools.

Mr. Pentecost interviewed Assistant District Attorney Battle, who sent him to Acting Captain O'Brien, at police headquarters, and he detailed Detective Sergeant McNaught and Policemen Rynders and Farley to help trap the alleged blackmailers. Mr. Pentecost called at Schulz's house, No. 124 Hudson street, at five o'clock on Saturday afternoon, October 19 last. Weiss came in for a few minutes. He signed his name to this letter, which Mr. Pentecost handed him:

To the Honorable District Attorney:—I deem it my duty to inform you that a very important business necessitates my presence at home, and I will leave this city to-day bound for Europe for good.

Weiss went out to stamp the letter. Pentecost paid $280 in marked bills to Schulz, while Weiss was out of the room. Schulz gave a receipt for it, as "for professional services rendered contra Nicolai Weiss, which amount I pledge to return to said gentleman if the result should not terminate satisfactorily."

Weiss returned to the room, said something to Schulz in German, pounced on the letter and the receipt, and began to tear them. There was a scuffle, and Detective McNaught rushed in.

"What's the trouble here?" he exclaimed. Schulz threw part of the $280 on the floor, and the detective found the rest of it in his pocket.

"What did you take this money from Mr. Pentecost for?" asked the detective.

"I took it to pay for Weiss's tools," answered Schulz. Nevertheless both Schulz and Weiss were arrested and finally lodged in the Tombs. They were indicted soon afterward, there being three counts against each of them,—namely, for compounding a felony, for bribery of a witness, and for attempted extortion.

They lay in the Tombs until Tuesday, January 21, last, when they were brought up for trial. But in the meantime Pentecost and Gatling had a windfall. The indictments against them were dismissed. The manner of that dismissal is worth telling in a separate paragraph.

Judge Allison served his last two days on the bench of the court of general sessions in the latter part of December last. During that time several indictments were dismissed. Assistant District Attorney Stephen J. O'Hare informed Judge Allison that Weiss, the complainant against Pentecost and Gatling, was himself under indictment and in the Tombs awaiting trial on the charge of trying to extort money from Pentecost and Gatling. Weiss's testimony, therefore, could not be relied upon to sustain the prosecution of his charge of larceny against his former counsel; so Mr. O'Hare moved that the indictment be dismissed. Judge Allison accordingly dismissed it.

Then, after three months' delay, Weiss and Schulz were brought up for trial on Tuesday, January 21, before Recorder Goff. They elected to be tried separately, and Schulz's trial was taken up first. He was defended by C. Gottschalk, of No. 375 Fulton street, Brooklyn. He was prosecuted by Assistant District Attorney Robert Townsend. The history of the case was recited on the witness stand as it has been told above.

Mr. Pentecost could not remember whether his firm charged a fee of $200 or $250 for defending Weiss when he pleaded guilty. Two bills of sale—one for the furniture and the other for the watchmaking tools—were put in evidence. They were in favor of Hugh O. Pentecost. Weiss testified that Gatling explained to him that the papers he signed were only chattel mortgages, so that money could be raised on the stuff; that Gatling said that he (Weiss) could redeem it all when he finished his term, by paying the amount raised on them, together with the interest. Furthermore, he declared, Mme. Moret, his landlady, at No. 122 Waverley place, told him in the Tombs that she had bought the furniture, and he might have it back by repaying her the price, with interest. Weiss said he was in a prison cell when he signed the papers, and it was very evident that he knew very little about the English language.

Mr. Pentecost made no denial of having entered into arrangements to pay a bribe of $280 to Schulz, but declared that he did so under the advice of Assistant District Attorney Battle.

Assistant District Attorney Townsend elected to try Schulz only upon the charge of "bribery of a witness." The counts in the indictment charging compounding a felony and attempted extortion were stricken out. In his summing up Mr. Townsend asked the jurors if they would believe Mr. Pentecost, an honorable gentleman, an honored member of a learned profession, who had been a clergyman and is an honorable, respected member of the community, or whether they would believe the story told by a self-confessed thief and ex-convict and a remarkable private detective. The answer to Mr. Townsend's question came in a rather startling form, as will appear below.

Recorder Goff, in his charge to the jury, said the issue was very simple. Was Schulz trying to extort a bribe from Mr. Pentecost, or was he merely trying to collect money he believed was rightly due to his friend Weiss? The jury went through the form of retiring to consider on a verdict, but reached it in one ballot. Only three minutes elapsed from the time the jurors left the box until they returned with the verdict that Schulz was not guilty.

Mr. Townsend then asked to have Weiss discharged on his own recognizance, saying he had no more evidence against him than he had presented against Schulz. Recorder Goff said it would be unfair to leave the stigma of an untried indictment upon Weiss, and ordered his trial.

A jury was empanelled. Mr. Townsend admitted he had not sufficient evidence to ask for a conviction, and Recorder Goff advised the jury to acquit Weiss. They did so forthwith.

C. Gottschalk, Schulz's counsel, hastened to police headquarters to obtain the $280 taken from Schulz by Detective Sergeant McNaught. He stopped in the office of Assistant District Attorney Unger, and learned that that official had just given Mr. Pentecost an order on Property Clerk Harriott, at police headquarters, directing him to "deliver the money to the person entitled to it."

When Mr. Gottschalk arrived at police headquarters, he found that Mr. Gatling had just left with the $280, he showing Mr. Harriott an order from Mr. Pentecost. Mr. Gottschalk spent two days in a vain effort to whistle the money back. He will apply to Recorder Goff for an order to show cause directing Property Clerk Harriott to pay him $280. According to the verdict of the jury, the money belongs to Schulz, as agent for Weiss.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

Target, section A.—The "Farmers' Voice," 334 Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill., said on February 1:

The congressman whose vote and influence is against the people, against justice, against the best interests of the republic, is a traitor as deep-dyed and wicked as a Benedict Arnold. Yet that is about all that congress has done for forty years. It has been the instrument of capital in various ways to oppress and wrong the people. It has wrung millions of dollars from their pockets to enrich favored classes; it has mocked the principle of popular sovereignty; it has stung liberty to the heart, and made the republic of to-day as unlike the republic of fifty years ago as black is unlike white; and the future promises no better than the past, unless the people assert their power at the ballot-box.

Show the absurdity of expecting to get reform by putting the people's interests in the hands of such a body.

Section B.—The "Christian Crisis," Box 121, Portland, Oregon, apparently a Christian Socialist organ, said on February 1:

We prate about stopping foreign immigration in order that Anarchists may be kept out of the country, but there is no land under the sun that has so many anarchists as our own. Every man who participates in a lynching is an anarchist; every man who, by fraudulent practices at the ballot-box, falsifies election returns is an anarchist; every man who is cognizant of such practices, but winks at the same because he or his party secure some political advantage thereby, is an anarchist; every man holding office who fails to enforce the laws as they exist on the statutes, or who does not vigilantly and sacredly guard the interests intrusted to him, is an anarchist; every judge who, on a flimsy technicality, sets aside a law which plainly expresses the will and wish of the people is an anarchist; and, coming right down to our own community, every man who does not demand a registration law, and every man who sees the second party in the State begging for representation in the election officers, without rising in his manhood and indignantly demanding the same justice be accorded his political opponents that he expects himself, is an anarchist.

Our dainty ministers who, with fragile dilettantism, make a pretence of preaching reform, are discreetly silent on the subject of honest elections and a fair count; it would be almost unfair to call them anarchists. It takes some nerve to be an anarchist, and our ministers seem to be so utterly negative and passive that it is difficult to find a place for them in the classification of social delinquents; but, if they must be classed, it can only be as anarchists, for, if they honestly believed in a government of the majority, they would thunder for honest elections instead of dishing up weak generalities to a drowsy congregation every Sunday.

There is no class in the country containing more anarchists than the business class. Mayor Swift of Chicago sized them up so well, in a speech before the Commercial club of that city recently, that I quote what he said: "The present mayor has within sixty days vetoed a half-dozen ordinances passed by your representatives giving space in the streets to property-owners. Who is it that comes into the common council and asks for such privileges? Who is it that are accused of offering bribes for such franchises? It is the same ones—the prominent citizens. Talk about anarchy! talk about breeding the spirit of communism! what does it more than the representative citizens of Chicago?

Tell this editor that despots are not Anarchists, even if they do break the law. Show how the adoption of real Anarchist principles would rid us of the evils he complains of. STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

A well-printed book of 165 large pages, consisting of two essays bearing the following titles respectively: "The True Constitution of Government in the Sovereignty of the Individual as the Final Development of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism"; "Cost the Limit of Price: A Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles in the Solution of the Social Problem." This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

PRICE IN CLOTH, $1.00; IN PAPER, 50 CENTS.

PREMIUM OFFER.

Any person purchasing of the undersigned a cloth-bound copy of "The Science of Society" will also receive, free of charge, one copy of "The Review of the Anarchist Case," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull, and of "The Reasons for Pardoning Schwab, *et al.*," by Gov. John P. Altgeld.

Any person purchasing a paper-bound copy will also receive, free of charge, one copy of Tolstoi's "Church and State."

Mailed, post-paid, by

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

BY ÉMILE ZOLA.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

In this his latest story Zola takes four typical marriages,—one from the nobility, one from the *bourgeoisie*, one from the petite *bourgeoisie*, and one from the working-people,—and describes, with all the power of his wondrous art, how each originates, by what motive each is inspired, how each is consummated, and how each results.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GORDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by

BENJ. R. TUCKER Box 1312, New York City.

Wind-Harp Songs.

Poems of life, love, nature, liberty, and death. An appropriate gift-book. Nicely bound.

Price, $1.00.

Mailed, post-paid, by the author,

J. WM. LLOYD, WESTFIELD, NEW JERSEY.

MUTUAL BANKING.

BY

WILLIAM B. GREENE.

Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium and the advantages of a free currency; a plan whereby to abolish interest, not by State intervention, but by first abolishing State intervention itself.

One of the most important works on finance in the English language.

New and Cheap Edition.

PRICE, TEN CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of

BENJ. R. TUCKER,

EDITOR OF LIBERTY.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 534 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Price, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN EMPIRE, Do They? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, $4.00.

BOMBS: The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By William A. Whittick. 187 pages. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

ANARCHISTS' MARCH. Tune: Björneborgarnes Marsch (Finnish War Song). Words by J. Wm. Lloyd. Price, 10 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

WORK AND WEALTH. By J. K. Ingalls. 31 pages. Price, 10 cents.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A discussion between Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews. Including the final replies of Mr. Andrews, rejected by the New York *Tribune*, and a subsequent discussion, occurring twenty years later, between Mr. James and Mr. Andrews. 121 pages. Price, 35 cents.

MY UNCLE BENJAMIN. A humorous, satirical, and philosophical novel. By Claude Tillier. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. With a sketch of the author's life and works by Ludwig Pfau. This work, though it has enjoyed the honor of three translations into German, has never before been translated into English. It is one of the most delightfully witty works ever written. Almost every sentence excites a laugh. It is thoroughly realistic, but not at all repulsive. Its satirical treatment of humanity's foibles and its jovial but profound philosophy have won its author the title of "the modern Rabelais." My Uncle Benjamin riddles with the shafts of his good-natured ridicule the shams of theology, law, medicine, commerce, war, marriage, and society generally. 312 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

THE QUINTESSENCE OF IBSENISM. By G. Bernard Shaw. Pronounced by the London *Saturday Review* a "most diverting book," and by the author "the most complete assertion of the validity of the human will as against all laws, institutions, *isms*, and the like, now procurable for a quarter." Ibsen's works have been read very widely in America, and there have been almost as many interpretations as readers. This conflict of opinion will cause the liveliest curiosity to know what view is taken by Mr. Bernard Shaw, who is not only one of the keenest students of Ibsen, but one of the wittiest writers in England. He takes up the plays *seriatim*, subjects each to searching analysis, and extracts the quintessence of the whole. Nearly 200 pages. Price, paper, 75 cents.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. A serious denunciation of States and Governments, under whatever name or form they may exist. By the famous statesman, Edmund Burke. 36 pages. Price, 10 cents.

HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION OF '71. A souvenir picture of the Paris Commune, presenting Fifty-One Portraits of the men whose names are most prominently connected with that great uprising of the people, and adorned with mottoes from Danton, Blanqui, Pyat, Proudhon, J. Wm. Lloyd, Tridon, and August Spies. Of all the Commune souvenirs that have ever been issued this picture stands easily first. It is executed by the phototype process from a very rare collection of photographs, measures 15 inches by 24, and is printed on heavy paper for framing. Over 50 portraits for 25 cents.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $3.00.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and radical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *exposé* of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS: Or, the Philosophy of Misery. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. This work constitutes the fourth volume of the Complete Works, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What Is Property?" It discusses, in a style as novel as profound, the problems of Value, Division of Labor, Machinery, Competition, Monopoly, Taxation, and Providence, showing that economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which counteracts the evils developed by its predecessor, and then, by developing evils of its own, necessitates its successor, the process to continue until a final force, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 469 pages octavo, in the highest style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $2.00.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

INVOLUNTARY IDLENESS. An exposition of the causes of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for labor and its products. By Hugo Bilgram. 119 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance, and Servitude of the People. 1886. By Lysander Spooner. 110 pages. Price, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade?" By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.00.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. 1844. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. 1867. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. 1870. By Lysander Spooner. 59 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ILLEGALITY OF THE TRIAL OF JOHN W. WEBSTER. Containing the substance of the author's larger work, "Trial by Jury," now out of print. 1850. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 10 cents

NATURAL LAW: Or, the Science of Justice. A treatise on natural law, natural justice, natural rights, natural liberty, and natural society; showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a crime. Part First. 1882. By Lysander Spooner. 31 pages. Price, 10 cents.

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress—to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States. By Lysander Spooner. Price, 3 cents.